

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the specification, the Abstract has been amended to correct minor editorial problems. A replacement Abstract is attached as a separate sheet.

Claims 4-5 and 9-12 remain in this application. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 have been canceled. Claims 11-12 have been added.

Claim 10 has been amended to include a, "means," for raising and lowering the aperture cover as disclosed at page 12, line 17 *et seq.* and Fig. 8. Claims 10 and 11 include the recitation of a, "stationary," bracket for the wire rope loop as disclosed at page 15, lines 1-3 and Fig. 3. Claim 11 adds an additional feature of a, "circumferential groove," shown in Fig. 6 in the specification.

In response to the Office Action of Jan. 4, 2005 Applicant requests re-examination and reconsideration of this application for patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 132.

Rejections under 35 USC 112

Claims 1-10 stand rejected as indefinite in that the extent of the claims is unclear. As now amended, claim 11 recites the subcombination of the reinforcement device. The device has utility as an add-on or after market improvement for existing

garage door installations. As such, the components of the device, *per se*, are an article of commerce. Claim 10 is directed to the combination of the reinforcement device and an aperture cover which is directed to the installed device, either as original equipment or after add-on installation. The amended claims now clearly reflect this organization.

Rejections under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 stand rejected as anticipated by Wedekind. Claims 1-3 and 7-8 have been canceled. Claims 4, 5 and 9 now depend from new claim 11. New claim 11 recites a stationary bracket supporting the wire loop. Wedekind does not show or illustrate a wire rope loop. The disclosure is directed to a, "bracket," which is movable vertically as element 14c is deployed vertically within guide member 13. The bracket portion 21 is illustrated in the Wedekind drawings as a rigid element with a fixed displacement angle to engage a hook 22.

By contrast, the amended and new claims recite a stationary bracket that supports a flexible wire loop. The flexibility of this arrangement allows for easier, quicker and efficient adjustment of the upper securing components without the precise measurements required for connecting two rigid elements together.

The Wedekind patent does not anticipate the claims since it

does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed device. Further, it cannot be modified to have a stationary bracket without destroying the disclosed function.

Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 6 and 10 stand rejected as obvious in view of Wedekind and Wells. Claim 6 has been canceled. Claim 10 has been amended to recite a stationary bracket for the wire loop. As stated above, Wedekind does not disclose a flexible wire loop nor a stationary bracket.

The wire loop disclosed by Wells is not located in the upper securing assembly, as required by the claims, because the upper assembly of Wells is composed of rigid elements fixed together, as shown in Fig.s 3 and 4 of the patent. The flexible cable anchors 50 of Wells are used to secure the reinforcement device to the door rather than securing the door to the building. Further, there is no indication, in Wells, that the cables could be substituted for the upper assembly. Therefore, there is nothing in Wells that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to modify a rigid upper coupling with a flexible wire rope.

SUMMARY

In light of the foregoing remarks and amendment to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner will now

find the claims of the application allowable. Favorable reconsideration of the application is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,


C. Fred Rosenbaum
C. Fred Rosenbaum
Registration # 27110

McHale & Slavin, P.A.
2855 PGA Boulevard
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410
(561) 625-6575 (Voice)
(561) 625-6572 (Fax)